United States District Court Southern District of Texas

ENTERED

January 15, 2025
Nathan Ochsner, Clerk

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION

| F. Chaziya and E. Mukuvare, | § 8 | |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------|
| r. Oliaziya aliu E. Mukuvare, | § § | |
| Plaintiffs, | § | |
| | § | Civil Action No. 4:24-cv-02656 |
| V. | § | |
| | § | |
| Visa Solutions, LLC and Navajo | § | |
| Express, Inc., | § | |
| | § | |
| Defendants. | § | |

ORDER ON MOTION FOR LEAVE

On January 14, 2025, Defendant Visa Solutions filed a motion requesting leave to submit a reply in support of its pending motion to dismiss. Dkt. 38. The Court finds no good cause for allowing the belated reply.

First, the reply brief was due on December 26, 2024, ten days after Plaintiff's response was filed.¹ See Hon. Charles R. Eskridge III, Court Procedures § 17(f) (10 days for a reply); Dkt. 34 (response filed December 16, 2024). Yet Visa Solutions offers no justification for missing that deadline by almost three weeks.

_

¹ Visa Solutions's motion appears to rely on the undersigned's procedures. But those procedures state explicitly that they are superseded by any conflicting requirements of the referring district judge. *See* Yvonne Y. Ho, Court Procedures (warning in underline on cover page).

Second, the proposed reply brief fails to comply with controlling procedures. It is more than double the permissible length for reply briefs. *Compare* Dkt. 38-1 at 20 (4,051 words), *with* Hon. Charles R. Eskridge III, Court Procedures § 18(c) (2,000-word limit for reply briefs).

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that Visa Solutions' motion for leave to file a reply (Dkt. 38) is **DENIED**.

Signed on January 15, 2025, at Houston, Texas.

nne Y. Ho

United States Magistrate Judge